arXiv:1610.05229v2 [math.PR] 26 Oct 2016

THE HÖRMANDER CONDITION FOR DELAYED STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

REDA CHHAIBI AND IBRAHIM EKREN

Abstract. In this paper, we are interested in path-dependent stochastic differential equations (SDEs) which are controlled by Brownian motion and its delays. Within this non-Markovian context, we prove a Hörmander-type criterion for the regularity of solutions. Indeed, our criterion is expressed as a spanning condition with brackets. A novelty in the case of delays is that noise can "flow from the past" and give additional smoothness thanks to semi-brackets.

Our proof follows the general lines of Malliavin's proof, in the Markovian case, which led to the development of Malliavin calculus. In order to handle the non-Markovian aspects of this problem and to treat anticipative integrals in a path-wise fashion, we heavily invoke rough path integration.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
Structure of the paper 4
2. Preliminaries 5
2.1. Stochastic integration and rough paths 5
2.2. Well-posedness of the SDE and Itô formula 8
3. The Malliavin derivative 10
3.1. Derivatives 10
3.2. Factorization of the Malliavin derivative 12
3.3. Analysis on $[T_h, T]$ 13
4. Malliavin's argument: smoothing by Gaussian noise 14
4.1. The evolution of Z_F and its derivatives 15
4.2. Proof of Theorem 1.5 16
5. Examples 17
5.1. Uniformly elliptic diffusions 17
5.2. Langevin Equation with Delay 17
5.3. Noise flowing from the past and semi-brackets 18
References 18

Date: October 27, 2016.

Key words and phrases. Hörmander-type criterion, Malliavin calculus, Delayed stochastic differential equation, Rough path integration.

1. Introduction

This is a first paper on the general question of smoothness for marginals of solutions to (non-Markovian) SDEs. Here, we fix a time maturity $T > 0$ and $(h_i)_{0\leq i\leq N-1} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ is an increasing sequence of delays satisfying:

$$0 = h_0 < h_1 < h_2 < \cdots < h_{N-1} < T \ . \tag{1.0.1}$$

We also fix $m, d > 0$ two integers and consider the random variable $X_T \in \mathbb{R}^d$ where $(X_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ is the solution to a delayed SDE:

$$X_t = X_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{m} \int_0^t V_k(r, X) \circ dW_r^k \ , \text{ for all } t \geq 0 \tag{1.0.2}$$

$$X_t = X_0 \ , \text{ for all } t \leq 0 \ . \tag{1.0.3}$$

The process $(W^k)_{1\leq k\leq m}$ is an m-dimensional Brownian motion. The vector fields are of the form

$$V_k = V_k(t, X) = V_k\left(t, X_t, X_{t-h_1}, \dots X_{t-h_{N-1}}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^d \ ,$$

and depend smoothly on delayed values of the path X. By convention, the additional index $k = 0$ will refer to time and $W_t^0 = t$. Notice that the Stratonovich stochastic integration $\circ dW_\cdot^k$ is ill-defined as the integrand has no reason to be a semi-martingale. At this point, we leave to later the discussion regarding which theory of stochastic integration is invoked. Also $N = 1$ recovers the usual Markovian setting.

The Markovian setting i.e when $V_k = V_k(t, X_t)$ has a quite beautiful answer in the form of Hörmander's spanning condition [Hör67]. Of course, the language of Hörmander was functional analysis and PDEs. The translation from probability to PDEs is readily obtained when one remembers that densities are fundamental solutions to the forward Fokker-Planck PDE. Malliavin's proof pushed further by giving a probabilistic approach. We recommend [Hai11] for a pedagogical review.

We choose to work under the Stratonovich convention and such a choice is not inoccuous. Indeed, it is well-known that the Stratonovich reformulation in terms of vector fields is the right language for "geometric" arguments (see for e.g [Hsu02]). The Hörmander condition itself is very geometric by nature, since it morally says that heat dissipates along the vector fields V_k and their brackets, due to the erratic movement of Brownian motion. Another reason is our use of "geometric rough paths" (see [FH14, Chapter 2.2] for a definition and [FH14, Chapter 3] for the discussion) thanks to which the Itô formula looks similar to the usual chain rule.

In the literature, there two ways of understanding the word "non-Markovian" regarding the topic of Hörmander's hypoellipticity. On the one hand, certain authors as [CF10, HP13, CHLT15] mean that the SDE's driving noise is a fractional Brownian motion. On the other hand, another legitimate direction of investigation is to consider a source of non-Markovianity which is the path-dependence of our SDE. To the best of the authors' knowledge, regularity under a non-Markovian nature originating from path-dependence has been treated by [Bel04], in the form of delays and in [Str83] with a dependence via a kernel. Both Bell and Stroock rely heavily on Malliavin calculus.

Ultimately, we are interested in SDEs with the most general path-dependence. However, in the present paper, we choose to focus on the setting of SDEs with delays. As such, we mainly revisit Section 4 of [Bel04], and [BM91], [BM95] with a rough path approach and aiming for a Hörmander-type spanning condition.

Setting: Let α be a real satisfying $\frac{1}{3} < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}$ and let $\mathcal{C}^\alpha$ be the Banach space of α-Hölder continuous functions and for a given a, $\mathcal{C}^\alpha_a$ is the subset of $\mathcal{C}^\alpha$ that contains paths are equal to a at time 0. For a vector field

$$\begin{array}{rccc} F: & [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^{d\times N} & \to & \mathbb{R}^d \\ & (t,x_0,x_1,\dots,x_{N-1}) & \mapsto & F(t,x_0,\dots,x_{N-1}) \end{array}$$

and a path $(t,\mathbf{x})\in[0,T]\times\mathcal{C}^\alpha$ we define the partial derivatives of the functional F as the elements given by:

$$\partial_i F(t,\mathbf{x}) = (\partial_{x_i}F)(t,\mathbf{x}_t,\dots,\mathbf{x}_{t-h_{N-1}}) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R}^d,\mathbb{R}^d)\ , \tag{1.0.4}$$

$$\partial_t F(t,\mathbf{x}) = (\partial_t F)(t,\mathbf{x}_t,\dots,\mathbf{x}_{t-h_{N-1}}) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^d)\ . \tag{1.0.5}$$

Note that for all $i=0,\dots N-1$ these partial derivatives measure the sensitivity of the vector field F with respect to the i-th delay. The action of $\partial_i F$ on a vector a vector $v\in\mathbb{R}^d$ will be denoted $\partial_i F\cdot v$.

The delay case is also the setting of [NNT+08] where the authors prove well-posedness for SDEs driven by rough paths and in particular for fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H>\frac{1}{3}$. Also, given the right integration framework, which will be given in the preliminaries, we shall see that there is global existence and uniqueness of solutions under the following analytic assumptions.

Assumption 1.1 (The analytic assumptions)**.** *The family of functions*

$$V_k : \mathbb{R}_+\times\mathbb{R}^{d\times N}\to\mathbb{R}^d$$

are smooth with bounded derivatives at all order and satisfy for all $k=1\dots m$,

$$\partial_0 V_k\cdot V_k \text{ is uniformly Lipschitz.} \tag{1.1.1}$$

In our main Theorem 1.5, we give a criterion in the form of spanning conditions, which is a geometric assumption. We now define the analog of Hörmander's condition for delayed diffusions.

Definition 1.2. *1) We introduce first the Lie brackets of the vector fields with respect to the end-point of X:*

$$[U,V] = \partial_0 U\cdot V - \partial_0 V\cdot U \tag{1.2.1}$$

where ∂_0 stands for the derivative defined at (1.0.4).

2) Given the SDE (1.0.2), we define sets of vector fields which span the Lie algebra generated by the V_k:

$$\mathcal{V}_0 := \{(s,\mathbf{x})\to V_k(s,\mathbf{x}) : k=1,\cdots,m\} \text{ and}$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{j+1} := \mathcal{V}_j\cup\{[U,V_k] : U\in\mathcal{V}_j, k=1,\cdots,m\}\,.$$

3) We also define extensions of these sets by the contribution of V_0 and semi-brackets:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\mathcal{V}}_j \ :=\ & \mathcal{V}_j\bigcup\{(s,\mathbf{x})\to[F,V_0](s,\mathbf{x})+\partial_t F(s,\mathbf{x})+\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\partial_i F(s,\mathbf{x})\cdot V_0(s-h_i,\mathbf{x}) : F\in\mathcal{V}_{j-1}\}\\ & \bigcup\{(s,\mathbf{x})\to\partial_i F(s,\mathbf{x})\cdot V_k(s-h_i,\mathbf{x}) : F\in\mathcal{V}_{j-1},\ k=1\cdots m,\ i=1,\dots,N-1\}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.3. *i) The bracket $[F,V_k]$, $\partial_t F$ and $\partial_i F$ are well defined for all $F\in\mathcal{V}_j$ and $k\geq 0$ since both $F(t,\mathbf{x})$ and $V_k(t,\mathbf{x})$ can be expressed as smooth functions of $(t,\mathbf{x}_t,\dots\mathbf{x}_{t-h_{N-1}})$.*

ii) Note that for $j>0$, the set $\mathcal{V}_j$ is smaller than its Markovian counter-part that also contains the brackets with V_0. The bracket with V_0 is introduced at $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_j$ and we are able to infer regularity results for diffusions such as the Langevin equation with delay (treated in Section 5).

iii) The fundamental difference between $\mathcal{V}_j$ and $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_j$ is the fact that the elements of the first are functions of $(t, \mathbf{x}_t, \dots \mathbf{x}_{t-h_{N-1}})$ but not the elements of the latter.

Notice that in the non-Markovian case the functionals V_k are necessarily depending on t in a peculiar manner as time plays a special role. Thus, unlike [Hai11] for example, we made the choice of *not* treating the time variable as an additional dimension and adjust the brackets with respect to V_0 by adding the time derivative. However, the estimate on the drift part does not allow us to give separate contributions for each of the different terms in the sum

$$(s, \mathbf{x}) \to [F, V_0](s, \mathbf{x}) + \partial_t F(s, \mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \partial_i F(s, \mathbf{x}) \cdot V_0(s - h_i, \mathbf{x}).$$

We can only rely on the contribution of the sum to produce smoothness.

Assumption 1.4 (The geometric assumption - Hörmander's hypoellipticity condition)**.** *We assume either of the following hypotheses:*

(1) *Weak hypoellipticity: $\exists j_0$ such that*

$$\inf_{|\eta|=1} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha_{X_0}} \sup_{F \in \mathcal{V}_{j_0}} |\eta F(T, \mathbf{x})| > 0 \ .$$

(2) *Strong hypoellipticity : $\exists j_0$ such that*

$$\inf_{|\eta|=1} \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha_{X_0}} \sup_{F \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}_{j_0}} |\eta F(T, \mathbf{x})| > 0 \ .$$

(3) *The bounded case : The process $(X_t)_{t \in [0,T]}$ is uniformly bounded by a deterministic constant and there exists $j_0 \geq 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha_{X_0}$ and for all $|\eta| = 1$ the pointwise Hormander condition hold*

$$\sup_{F \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}_{j_0}} |\eta F(T, \mathbf{x})| > 0 \ . \tag{1.4.1}$$

We are now ready to state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 1.5. *Let X_T be the marginal of the solution to the SDE (1.0.2). If the analytic assumption 1.1 is satisfied, as well as either of the geometric assumptions in 1.4, then X_T has a smooth density with respect to the Lebesgue measure.*

We give the proof of this theorem only at Subsection 4.2 after handling all the prerequisites.

Structure of the paper. In the Preliminaries of Section 2, we start by making precise rough path integration against Brownian motion and its delays. This will show that Eq. (1.0.2) is well posed in Stratonovich form with unique solutions.

Section 3 defines and collects results on the Malliavin derivative in our non-Markovian context.

Section 4 proves our main result by taking Malliavin's original approach. We define the classical Malliavin Gram matrix, quickly review how its control yields smoothness and relate it to tangent flows.

Finally we conclude with examples in Section 5. These are interesting in their own right. We give a treatment of smoothness for the Langevin equation with delay, as well as cases where smoothness comes from "semi-brackets".

Acknowledgements. R.C. and I.E. would like thank Y. Bruned, L. Coutin and J. Teichmann for fruitful conversations. Research of I.E. is partly supported by the Swiss National Foundation Grant SNF 200021_153555.

2. Preliminaries

From now on, m will refer to the number of Brownian motions we will be working with and d is the dimension of the process X we will study. $\{e_j\}_{j=1,\cdots,d}$ is the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\{f_k\}_{k=1,\cdots,m}$ the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^m$.

Throughout the paper V will stand for a finite dimensional vector space. For any V, we denote by $\mathcal{C}([0,T],V)$ the space of continuous V-valued paths. $\mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T],V)$ will denote the subspace of α-Hölder continuous functions. We will drop the dependence in V if it isobvious from context. Also, given a path $X:[0,T]\to V$ and $(s,t)\in[0,T]^2$, we write the increment between s and t as $X_{s,t}=X_t-X_s$.

Let us start by giving a meaning to the Equation (1.0.2) and a solid foundation to its treatment.

2.1. Stochastic integration and rough paths.

2.1.1. *Enhancing Brownian motion to a rough path.* In this section we give statements for any given $(h_i)_{0\le i\le N-1}\in\mathbb{R}_+^N$ increasing sequence of delays. The results will be valid upon changing h to another sequence of delays if necessary. We set $V(h):=\mathbb{R}^{m\times N}$ and consider the $V(h)$-valued process:

$$\mathcal{W}_t(h)=\left(\mathcal{W}_t^{k,j}\right)_{\{k=1,\dots,m,\ j=0,\dots,N-1\}}:=\left(W_t,\ W_{t-h_1},\ W_{t-h_2},\ \dots,W_{t-h_{N-1}}\right),$$

where each component is understood as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^m$. When h is understood from context, we drop the dependence in h and write $\mathcal{W}_t$ instead of $\mathcal{W}_t(h)$. Also, there is no loss of generality in assuming that W is two-sided: $(W_t;t\ge0)$ and $(W_{-t};t\ge0)$ are independent Brownian motions. Taking W to be two-sided will avoid problems of boundary effects and delays can be arbitrarily large. A relevant quantity will be the first delayed date before maturity

$$T_h:=T-h_1. \tag{2.0.1}$$

The goal of this subsection is to establish that $\mathcal{W}$ is a bona-fide rough path against which we can integrate. We now give a lemma concerning the quadratic covariation of the process $\mathcal{W}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Consider two indices i,j, and two reals h,h'. For a partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $[s,t]$ with mesh size going to zero, we have the limit in L^2 and in probability:*

$$\langle W^i_{h+\cdot},W^j_{h'+\cdot}\rangle_{s,t}:=\lim_{|\mathcal{P}|\to0}\sum_{[u,v]\in\mathcal{P}}\left(W^i_{h+v}-W^i_{h+u}\right)\left(W^j_{h'+v}-W^j_{h'+v}\right)=\delta_{i,j}\delta_{h,h'}(t-s)\ .$$

Proof. The case $h=h'$ is obvious. By symmetry and time shifting, we can assume $h>0$ and $h'=0$. For shorter notations, set

$$\mathcal{C}=\sum_{[u,v]\in\mathcal{P}}\left(W^i_v-W^i_u\right)\left(W^j_{h+v}-W^j_{h+u}\right)\ .$$

Upon asuming $2|\mathcal{P}|<h$, we have that $\mathbb{E}\left(\mathcal{C}\right)=0$ as the invervals $[u,v],[u+h,v+h]$ are disjoint. Also:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\mathcal{C}^2\right)&=\sum_{[u,v],[w,x]\in\mathcal{P}}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(W^i_v-W^i_u\right)\left(W^j_{h+v}-W^j_{h+u}\right)\left(W^i_x-W^i_w\right)\left(W^j_{h+x}-W^j_{h+w}\right)\right]\\&=\sum_{[u,v]\in\mathcal{P}}(v-u)^2\mathbb{E}\left(\mathcal{N}^2\right)^2\overset{|\mathcal{P}|\to0}{\longrightarrow}0\ .\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, in the double sum, the right-most interval among $[u,v],[u+h,v+h],[w,x],[w+h,x+h]$ does not intersect the others except if $[u,v]=[w,x]$. □

We fix α, θ satisfying $1/3 < \alpha < 1/2 < \theta < 2\alpha$. Recall that an α-Holder path X is lifted to a rough by adjoining another path $\mathbb{X}$ which is 2α-Holder. We recall the following definition from [FH14] of the topology we use:

Definition 2.2. *We say that the pair $(X, \mathbb{X})$ is an α-Holder rough path on a Banach space V, denoted $(X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T], V)$, if the mappings*

$$X : [0,T] \to V \text{ and } \mathbb{X} : [0,T]^2 \to V \otimes V$$

satisfy

$$\|X\|_\alpha := \sup_{0\le s<t\le T} \frac{|X_{s,t}|}{|t-s|^\alpha} < \infty, \quad \|\mathbb{X}\|_{2\alpha} := \sup_{0\le s\neq t\le T} \frac{|\mathbb{X}_{s,t}|}{|t-s|^{2\alpha}} < \infty. \tag{2.2.1}$$

We denote $|||X|||_\alpha := \|X\|_\alpha + \sqrt{\|\mathbb{X}\|_{2\alpha}}$ and $\|X\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} := \|X\|_\alpha + \|X\|_\infty$.

For $(X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T], V)$, we say that $(X, \mathbb{X})$ is a geometric rough path, denoted $(X, \mathbb{X}) \in \mathcal{C}_g^\alpha([0,T], V)$ if

$$Sym(\mathbb{X}_{s,t}) = \frac{1}{2} X_{s,t} \otimes X_{s,t}, \text{ for all } t, s \in [0,T]. \tag{2.2.2}$$

We first need to define the first order iterated integrals of $\mathcal{W}$ in order to form the lift $\mathbb{W}$ also known as Lévy stochastic areas. With $V = \mathbb{R}^{m\times N}$, it is an $(V \otimes V)$-valued path and it is given for $s < t$:

$$\left(\mathbb{W}_{s,t}^{k_1,i_1,k_2,i_2}\right)_{\left\{\substack{k_1,k_2=1,\dots,m,\\ i_1,i_2=0,\dots,N-1}\right\}} = \left(\int_s^t W_{s-h_{i_1},r-h_{i_1}}^{k_1} \circ dW_{r-h_{i_2}}^{k_2}\right)_{\left\{\substack{k_1,k_2=1,\dots m,\\ i_1,i_2=0,\dots,N-1}\right\}}. \tag{2.2.3}$$

The matter at hand is to give a precise meaning of the above integrals in such a way that the "first order calculus" condition (2.2.2) holds. We have two possibilities.

The first possibility is to define the iterated integrals as limits in probability of Riemann sums. More precisely, if $\mathcal{P}$ is a partition of $[s,t]$ with mesh size $|\mathcal{P}| \to 0$ and (X, Y) is a pair of paths:

$$\int_s^t X_r \circ dY_r = \lim_{|\mathcal{P}|\to 0} \sum_{[u,v]\in\mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{2}(X_u + X_v)(Y_v - Y_u).$$

The above limit is well-defined for $(X, Y) = \left(W_{r-h_{i_1}}^{k_1}, W_{r-h_{i_2}}^{k_2}\right)$ as soon as $h_{i_2} \le h_{i_1}$. Indeed, the left-centered Riemann sum converges by standard adapted Itô integration and we can use Lemma 2.1 to pass to the Stratonovich case. In the other case $h_{i_2} > h_{i_1}$, notice that we have the first order calculus rule at the discrete level:

$$\sum_{[u,v]\in\mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{2}(X_u + X_v)(Y_v - Y_u) + \sum_{[u,v]\in\mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{2}(Y_u + Y_v)(X_v - X_u) = X_t Y_t - X_s Y_s \tag{2.2.4}$$

and as such the second term converges to a limit as soon as the first does. Therefore, (2.2.3) is well-defined as limits in probability of Riemann sums and gives a geometric rough path, as the first order calculus rule is built-in at the discrete level already.

The second possibility is to invoke an anticipative integration theory such as Skorohod's. In their paper [NP88] Section 4, Nualart and Pardoux form anticipative Riemann sums which are centered "A la Stratonovich", prove that they converge and relate them to Skorohod's integral. In any case limits in probability of Riemann sums and anticipative Stratonovich integrals "A la Nualart-Pardoux" coincide. See [FH14, Exercice 5.17] as well as [OP89].

2.1.2. *Integration with respect to $\mathcal{W}$.* Thanks to this paragraph, for systems controlled by delays, we will give a proper meaning to the integration in Eq. (1.0.2).

Definition 2.3. *We say that $Y \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T],V)$ is controlled by $\mathcal{W}$ on a Banach space V if there exists $Y' \in \mathcal{C}^\alpha([0,T],\mathcal{L}(V(h),V))$ such that R_Y defined by*

$$Y_{s,t} = Y'_s \mathcal{W}_{s,t} + R_Y(s,t), \text{ for all } 0 \le s \le t \le T, \tag{2.3.1}$$

satisfies $\|R_Y\|_{2\alpha} < \infty$. We denote the space of controlled rough paths by

$$(Y,Y') \in \mathcal{D}^{2\alpha}_{\mathcal{W}}([0,T],V)$$

and the norm in this space by

$$\|Y,Y'\|_{\mathcal{W},2\alpha} := |Y_0| + \|Y'\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} + \|R_Y\|_{2\alpha}.$$

We recall the following Gubinelli integration theorem from [FH14, Theorem 4.10].

Theorem 2.4. *For all Banach space V, for all $(Y,Y') \in \mathcal{D}^{2\alpha}_{\mathcal{W}}([0,T],\mathcal{L}(V(h),V))$ the controlled integration mapping*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}^{2\alpha}_{\mathcal{W}}([0,T],\mathcal{L}(V(h),V)) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}^{2\alpha}_{\mathcal{W}}([0,T],V) \\ (Y,Y') & \mapsto & \left(\int_0^\cdot Y d\mathcal{W}_t, Y\right) \end{array}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^t Y(r)d\mathcal{W}_r &= \sum_{\substack{1\le k\le m \\ 0\le i\le N-1}} \int_s^t Y^{k,i}(r) d\mathcal{W}^{k,i}_r \\ &:= \sum_{\substack{1\le k\le m \\ 0\le i\le N-1}} \lim_{|\mathcal{P}|\to 0} \sum_{[u,v]\in\mathcal{P}} \left(Y^{k,i}_u \mathcal{W}^{k,i}_{u,v} + \sum_{\substack{1\le k_2\le m \\ 0\le i_2\le N-1}} ((Y^{k,i})'_u)^{k_2,i_2} \mathbb{W}^{k,i,k_2,i_2}_{u,v} \right) \end{aligned}$$

is continuous and bounded with bound

$$\left\| \int_0^\cdot Y d\mathcal{W}_t, Y \right\|_{\mathcal{W},2\alpha} \le C\left(\|Y\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} + \|\mathcal{W}\|_\alpha \|R_Y\|_{2\alpha} + \|\mathbb{W}\|_{2\alpha} \|Y'\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha} \right) .$$

2.1.3. *Roughness of $\mathcal{W}$.* For the convenience of the reader, we recall the concept of roughness for rough paths as in [FH14, Definition 6.7]. Our goal in this subsection is to prove roughness for $\mathcal{W}$. This will be crucial in order to use the so-called Norris lemma, a quantitative version of the Doob-Meyer decomposition.

Definition 2.5. *A path $X : [0,T] \to V$ is called θ-Holder rough on scale $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and on the interval $[0,T]$ if there exists $L > 0$ such that for any $\varphi \in V^*$, $s \in [0,T]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0)$, there exists $t \in [0,T]$ such that*

$$|t-s| \le \varepsilon \ , \ \text{and} \ \ |\varphi X_{s,t}| \ge L\varepsilon^\theta |\varphi|.$$

The largest such L is called the modulus of θ-Holder roughness of X.

Lemma 2.6. *We can choose a version of the Brownian motion such that $\mathcal{W}$ is θ-Holder rough at scale $\frac{T}{2}$ on $[0,T]$.*

Proof. The proof of roughness is exactly the same as the proof of [FH14, Proposition (6.11)]. The only ingredient that is missing is the small ball estimate for $\mathcal{W}$, which we now prove.

Set $\Delta(h) := \min_{0\le i\le N-2} |h_i - h_{i+1}|$ with the convention that it is infinity when $N = 1$. We shall prove that there are constants $c, C > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta > 0$ and $\varphi = (\varphi_{i,k}) \in V^*$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\le t-s\le\delta} |\varphi \mathcal{W}_{s,t}| < \varepsilon \right) \le C \exp\left(-\frac{c|\varphi|^2 (\delta \wedge \Delta(h))}{\varepsilon^2} \right) , \tag{2.6.1}$$

where $|\varphi|$ is the Euclidian norm. This estimate is sufficient to replace [FH14, Eq. (6.11) p. 91] so that all the arguments carry verbatim. To prove Eq. (2.6.1), we start by using the translation invariance and symmetry of Brownian motion increments:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq t-s\leq\delta}|\varphi\mathcal{W}_{s,t}|<\varepsilon\right)\\
=&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq t-s\leq\delta}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\sum_{k=1}^{m}\varphi_{i,k}W^k_{s-h_i,t-h_i}\right|<\varepsilon\right)\\
=&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq t\leq\delta}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\sum_{k=1}^{m}\varphi_{i,k}W^k_{h_i,h_i-t}\right|<\varepsilon\right)\\
\leq&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq t\leq\delta\wedge\Delta(h)}\left|\sum_{i=1}^{N-1}\sum_{k=1}^{m}\varphi_{i,k}W^k_{h_i,h_i-t}\right|<\varepsilon\right)\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Now notice that W being a two sided Brownian motion, the family of processes

$$\left(t\mapsto W^k_{h_i,h_i-t};0\leq t<\Delta(h)\right)_{i,k}$$

are independent Brownian motions as we have increments over disjoint intervals when changing i and independent Brownian motions when changing k. As such by packaging them into a single Brownian motion B and then invoking the standard small balls estimates, there exists constants c, C such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq t-s\leq\delta}|\varphi\mathcal{W}_{s,t}|<\varepsilon\right)\leq&\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq t\leq\delta\wedge\Delta(h)}|B_t|<\frac{\varepsilon}{|\varphi|}\right)\\
\leq&C\exp\left(-\frac{c|\varphi|^2\left(\delta\wedge\Delta(h)\right)}{\varepsilon^2}\right)\ .
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2.7. *The use of the two sided Brownian motion instead of the Brownian motion allows us to cancel the boundary effects in Lemma 2.6. However there is small price to pay here. In order to make the formulas work in the sequel, for all $k=0,\dots,m$, we extend V_k to negative times:*

$$V_k(s,\mathbf{x})=0,\ \textit{for all } s<0.$$

Note that this extension is continuous on $(-\infty,0)$ and on $(0,\infty)$. We will need to take care of the discontinuity at time 0.

2.2. **Well-posedness of the SDE and Itô formula.** Now that we specified the theory of integration required, Eq. (1.0.2) is a bona-fide SDE within the theory of rough differential equations [FH14, Chapter 8]. First, we see that under our delay framework, it is also well-posed.

Proposition 2.8 (Rough forms for the SDE)**.** *There exists a unique process*

$$(X_t;0\leq t\leq T)$$

which solves both the SDE (2.8.2), formulated in term of Itô integrals and the RDE:

$$X_t=X_0+\sum_{k=0}^{m}\int_0^t V_k(t,X)d\mathcal{W}^{k,0}_r\ . \tag{2.8.1}$$

As such it is both a semi-martingale and a controlled rough path satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|X, \{V_k(\cdot, X)\}_{k=1}^m\|_{\mathcal{W},2\alpha}^p\right] < \infty, \text{ for all } p \geq 1.$$

Proof. In [FH14, Theorem 8.4], it is explained that RDEs with smooth coefficients have locally unique solutions. Moreover, solutions are global in time thanks to [Lej12, Proposition 2], which gives boundedness under weaker conditions than our Analytical Assumptions 1.1 ([Lej12, Hypothesis 1]). □

For completeness, we show that it is possible to reformulate the SDE in an Itô form as the vector fields are adapted. To do so, one should define the Itô lift $\mathbb{W}^{\text{Itô}}$ from $\mathbb{W}$ by taking into account quadratic variations:

$$\mathbb{W}_{s,t}^{k_1,i_1,k_2,i_2} = \left(\mathbb{W}_{s,t}^{\text{Itô}}\right)^{k_1,i_1,k_2,i_2} + \frac{1}{2}\langle W_{\cdot-h_{k_1}}^{i_1}, W_{\cdot-h_{k_2}}^{i_2}\rangle_{s,t} .$$

The covariation of Brownian motion against its own delay is zero which is known as absence of autocorrelation. This was already formalized in Lemma 2.1. It is classical to see that rough integration against adapted processes and with the Itô lift $\mathbb{W}^{\text{Itô}}$ coincides with the usual adapted stochastic integration. As such Eq. (1.0.2) is readily reformulated as an Itô integral:

(2.8.2)

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= X_0 + \int_0^t \left(V_0(r, X) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^m \partial_0 V_k(r, X) \cdot V_k(r, X)\right) dr + \sum_{k=1}^m \int_0^t V_k(r, X) dW_r^k \\ &= X_0 + \sum_{k=0}^m \int_0^t \widetilde{V}_k(r, X) dW_r^k , \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{V}_0(r, X) &= V_0(r, X) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^m \partial_0 V_k(r, X) \cdot V_k(r, X) \text{ and,} \\ \widetilde{V}_i(r, X) &= V_i(r, X) \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq m. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that X is a semi-martingale although the integrands in the SDE are not necessarily semi-martingales. The reader more familiar with the Itô framework rather than rough paths can establish well-posedness of Eq. (2.8.2). Indeed, the vector fields $\widetilde{V}_k$ are Lipschitz continuous in the variable $\mathbf{x}$ for every fixed t, uniformly. We have existence and uniqueness of strong solutions to the Equation (1.0.2) via a standard implementation of the Picard iteration scheme, only in the function space $\mathcal{C}\left([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d\right)$ (see the more general theorem 4.6 in [LS01]). Via standard arguments in this framework, solutions are global with $\mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{0\leq s\leq T} |X_s|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty$.

We now want some sort of Itô formula for processes of the form

$$F(t, X_t, X_{t-h_1}, \ldots, X_{t-h_{N-1}}).$$

It is easy to see that this process has no reason to be a semi-martingale and as such, we can only give a rough integral formulation of the Itô lemma. Also after formal computations one notices that the Gubinelli derivative of this process are not controlled by $\mathcal{W}$ and they cannot be integrated with respect to $\mathcal{W}$. However, they are controlled by $\{W_{t-(h_j+h_i)}\}_{0\leq i\leq j\leq N-1}$.

Thus we define the family of double delays

$$\overline{h} := \{h_{j_1} + h_{j_2} : j_1, j_2 = 0 \ldots N-1\}$$

and choose a family of index $J \subset \{0, \ldots, N-1\}^2$ with minimal cardinality such that $\overline{h} = \{h_{j_1} + h_{j_2} : j = (j_1, j_2) \in J\}$. By the construction at Subsection 2.1, we obtain a

rough path $\mathcal{W}_t(\overline{h}) := \{W_{t-(h_{j_1}+h_{j_2})}\}_{j\in J}$ along with its first order iterated integral $\mathbb{W}(\overline{h})$. The following holds:

Proposition 2.9 (Itô formula)**.** *Let $F : \mathbb{R}_+ \times V(h) \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be a smooth function of time and $(X_t, X_{t-h_1}, \dots, X_{t-N-1})$. The path $t \mapsto F(t, X)$ is controlled by $\mathcal{W}(h)$ as the following control equation holds, for all $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ with $s \notin \{h_j : j = 0 \dots N-1\}$, we have:*

$$F(t,X) - F(s,X) = \sum_{\substack{1\leq k\leq m\\ 0\leq i\leq N-1}} \partial_i F(s,X)\cdot V_k(s-h_i,X)\mathcal{W}_{s,t}^{k,i} + R_F(s,t)\ , \tag{2.9.1}$$

with $\mathbb{E}[\|R_F\|_{2\alpha}^p] < \infty$ for all $p > 0$. Moreover, the Gubinelli derivatives of $t \mapsto F(t, X)$ are controlled by $\mathcal{W}(\overline{h})$ as for all $i = 0, \dots N-1$, $k = 1 \dots, m$ and $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ such that $s \notin \overline{h}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_i F(t,X)V_k(t-h_i,X) - \partial_i F(s,X)V_k(s-h_i,X)\\
&\quad= \sum_{\substack{1\leq l\leq m\\ 0\leq j\leq N-1}} \partial^2_{i,j}F(s,X)\cdot V_k(s-h_i,X)\cdot V_l(s-h_j,X)\mathcal{W}_{s,t}^{l,j}\\
&\quad+ \sum_{\substack{1\leq l\leq m\\ 0\leq j\leq N-1}} \partial_i F(s,X)\cdot\left[\partial_i V_k(s-h_i,X)\cdot V_l(s-h_i-h_j,X)\right]\mathcal{W}_{s-h_i,t-h_i}^{l,j}\\
&\quad+ R_{F,i,k}(t,s)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9.2}$$

Finally, we have the following rough integrals against $\big(\mathcal{W}(\overline{h}), \mathbb{W}(\overline{h})\big)$:

$$F(t,X) - F(s,X) = \int_s^t \sum_{\substack{1\leq k\leq m\\ 0\leq i\leq N-1}} \partial_i F(r,X)\cdot V_k(r-h_i,X)d\mathcal{W}_r^{k,i} + \int_s^t \partial_t F(r,X)dr\ . \tag{2.9.3}$$

Proof. Both control equations hold by virtue of a Taylor expansion and the use of Eq. (2.8.1). Eq. (2.9.3) is obtained by invoking the rough path Itô's formula given in [FH14, Theorem 7.6]. The first hypothesis required is that F and its Gubinelli derivative are controlled by $\big(\mathcal{W}(\overline{h}), \mathbb{W}(\overline{h})\big)$, which is a consequence of the two control equations (2.9.1) and (2.9.2). The second hypothesis [FH14, p.100 Eq.(7.8)] requires the computation of a Taylor expansion at order 2. Notice that since we use geometric rough paths, the bracket $[\mathcal{W}]$ defined in [FH14, Definition 5.5] is zero. □

Remark 2.10. *Following Remark 2.7 and the choice of extension for V_k, the equalities (2.9.1) and (2.9.2) for Gubinelli derivatives are only stated on open intervals between their successive delays.*

3. The Malliavin derivative

In the context of performing probabilistic constructions and estimating densities, one needs to be able to differentiate with respect to Brownian trajectories. This contribution of Malliavin brought functional analysis to probability.

3.1. Derivatives.

Let us start by the general notion of Fréchet derivative of a functional:

Definition 3.1 (**Fréchet derivative**)**.** *For H any vector subspace of $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}([0,T], \mathbb{R})$, the continuous functions from $[0,T]$ to $\mathbb{R}$, and $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}^d$, we define $DF(\mathbf{x})(h) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the Fréchet derivative of f at point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ and direction $h \in H$, as the limit*

$$Df(\mathbf{x})(h) := \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{f(\mathbf{x}+\varepsilon h) - f(\mathbf{x})}{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^d\ , \tag{3.1.1}$$

when it exists. For ease of notation, if f takes as input functions in $\mathcal{C}^d$, i.e from $[0,T]$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$, then for all $h \in \mathcal{C}^d$, we also define the Fréchet derivative matrix $Df(\mathbf{x})(h) \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ as the matrix whose j-th column is

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{f(s, \mathbf{x} + \varepsilon (h)_j) - f(s, \mathbf{x})}{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

where $(h)_j \in \mathcal{C}$ is the path of the j-th column of h. The functional f is said to be Fréchet differentiable if the Fréchet derivative exists and is a bounded linear operator. The operator norm is the supremum norm.

In the particular case of Brownian motion, we obtain the Malliavin derivative. In order to define the Malliavin derivative we introduce the Cameron-Martin space

$$H := \left\{ h \in L^0([0,T] : \mathbb{R}^m) : \ h' \in L^2([0,T] : \mathbb{R}^m), \ h(0) = 0 \right\}.$$

Let F be an $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued smooth functional that depends on the Brownian motion W. The Malliavin derivative of F applied to $h \in H$ is defined as the Fréchet differential of F:

$$\mathcal{D}F \cdot h := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{F(W + \varepsilon h) - F(W)}{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^d \ .$$

The iterated Malliavin derivatives $\mathcal{D}^j$ are defined in the same fashion from higher order Fréchet differentials. Then $\mathcal{D}^j$ acting on random variables is extended to the domain $\mathbb{D}^{j,p}$ in $L^p(\Omega), \ p \geq 1$, with respect to the norm:

$$\|F\|_{j,p} = \left[\mathbb{E}\left(|F|^p\right) + \sum_{k=1}^{j} \mathbb{E}\left(\left| \mathcal{D}^k F \right|^p_{H^{\otimes k}} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

Moreover, we write:

$$\mathbb{D}^{j,\infty} := \cap_{p \geq 1} \mathbb{D}^{j,p} \ .$$

For further details we refer to [Nua06, Section 1.2].

A standard notation is to represent the Mallavin derivative as an element in the Cameron-Martin space

$$\mathcal{D}F = \left(\mathcal{D}^1_t F, \dots, \mathcal{D}^m_t F \right)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$$

and write:

$$\mathcal{D}F \cdot h = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \int \mathcal{D}^j_t F \ \langle f^*_j, h'(t) \rangle dt \ .$$

Morally, at time t and for $j = 1, \cdots, m$, the operator $\mathcal{D}^j_t$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{D}^j_t F := \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{F(W + \varepsilon \mathbb{1}_{[t,T]} f_j) - F(W)}{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^d \ .$$

We denote by $\mathcal{D}_t F \in M_{d,m}(\mathbb{R})$ the matrix whose j-th column is $\mathcal{D}^j_t F$. The following proposition sums up the properties of the Malliavin derivative in our context.

Proposition 3.2 (Kusuoka-Stroock [KS84])**.** *For all $t \leq r$, the random variable X_r belongs to the space $\mathbb{D}^{1,\infty}$. Moreover, for all $j = 1 \dots m$, the Malliavin derivative $\mathcal{D}^j_r X_t$ of the random variable X_t satisfies:*

$$\mathcal{D}^j_r X_t = V_j(r, X) + \sum_{k=0}^{m} \int_r^t D\widetilde{V}_k(s, X) \left(\mathcal{D}^j_r X_\cdot \right) dW^k_s. \tag{3.2.1}$$

One also has $\mathcal{D}^j_r X_t = 0$ if $t < r$, as X_r is adapted. In matrix notation one has

$$\mathcal{D}_r X_t = V(r, X) + \sum_{k=0}^{m} \int_r^t D\widetilde{V}_k(s, X) \left(\mathcal{D}_r X_\cdot \right) dW^k_s$$

where $V(r,X)$ is the matrix whose columns are $V_j(r,X)$ for $j=1\dots m$.

Pointers to the proof. This is essentially [KS84, Lemma (2.9)]. Note that the latter reference uses Ito's formulation. Thus we start with the equation (2.8.2) and see that it satisfies the assumptions in [KS84, Lemma (2.9)].

Due to the analytical assumptions 1.1 the functions $\widetilde{V}_k$ admits Fréchet derivatives at all order and for all $h\in H$ the Malliavin derivatives $(\mathcal{D}X_s(h))_{s\in[0,T]}$ solves the SDE

$$\mathcal{D}^jX_t\cdot h=\int_0^t V_j(r,X)h'_r dr+\sum_{k=0}^m\int_0^t D\widetilde{V}_k(s,X)(\mathcal{D}^jX_\cdot\cdot h)dW_s^k\ . \tag{3.2.2}$$

Additionally, as proven by Kusuoka and Stroock, the mapping $\mathcal{D}^jX_t$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator on H hence the existence of $\{\mathcal{D}^j_rX_t\}_{r\in[0,T]}\in L^2([0,T]:\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{D}^jX_t(h)=\int_0^t\left[\mathcal{D}^j_rX_t\right]h'_r dr\text{ for all }h\in H.$$

Note that the equality

$$D\widetilde{V}_k(s,\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{x}')=\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}\partial_i\widetilde{V}_k(s,\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{x}'_{s-h_i}$$

implies thanks to Fubini

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t\mathcal{D}^j_rX_th'_rdr&=\int_0^tV_j(r,X)h'_rdr+\sum_{k=0}^m\sum_{i=0}^{N-1}\int_0^t\int_0^t\partial_i\widetilde{V}_k(s,X)\cdot\mathcal{D}^j_rX_{s-h_i}dW_s^kh'_rdr\\&=\int_0^tV_j(r,X)h'_rdr+\sum_{k=0}^m\int_0^t\int_0^tD\widetilde{V}_k(s,X)(\mathcal{D}^j_r X_\cdot)dW_s^kh'_rdr\end{aligned}$$

which implies by identification (3.2.1). □

3.2. **Factorization of the Malliavin derivative.** The main result of this section concerns a factorization of the Malliavin derivative.

Proposition 3.3. *Define the family of processes $(J_{r,t};0\le r\le t\le T)$ as the solution to the SDE:*

$$\begin{aligned}J_{r,t}&=\mathrm{id}+\sum_{k=0}^m\int_r^tD\widetilde{V}_k(s,X)\,(J_{r,\cdot})\,dW_s^k,\quad\text{for } r\le t,\\J_{r,t}&=0,\ \text{for } r>t\ .\end{aligned}\tag{3.3.1}$$

Then, for $0\le r\le t\le T$, the tangent process and the Malliavin derivative satisfy

$$J_{r,t}\times V\,(r,X)=\mathcal{D}_r\,(X_t)\tag{3.3.2}$$

where on the LHS, the product denotes a matrix product.

Proof. Inspecting equations (3.2.1) and (3.3.1), we recognize the same stochastic differential equation with a different initial condition. The starting condition $V_j\,(r,X)$ in equation (3.2.1) is replaced by the constant f_j in the matrix equation (3.3.1). The equation (3.3.1) is linear in the original condition and one can multiply by the constant $V_j\,(r,X)$ to identify the Malliavin derivative and the multiplied flow. Hence we obtain the result. □

Remark 3.4. *In the Markovian setting, let $X^{t,x}_\cdot$ be the solution to (1.0.2) such that $X^{t,x}_t=x$. By uniqueness of the solution, there exists flow maps*

$$\left(\Phi_{t,s}:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}^d\right)_{0\le t\le s\le T}$$

such that $\Phi_{t,s}(x) = X_s^{t,x}$. *It is well-known that* Φ *are in fact flows of diffeomorphisms. We recommend the works of Kunita for example (*[Kun84] *and* [Kun97, Chapter 4]*). The tangent process is a process of invertible linear maps* $J_{t,T}(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ *obtained via:*

$$\forall h \in \mathbb{R}^d,\ J_{t,T}(x) \cdot h := \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{X_T^{t,x+\varepsilon h} - X_T^{t,x}}{\varepsilon} = d\Phi_{t,T}(x) \cdot h \ .$$

Here d *stands for the usual differential. Moreover, we have:*

$$J_{t,T}(x) = \mathrm{id} + \sum_{k=0}^{m} \int_t^T \left[\frac{\partial \widetilde{V}_k}{\partial x} \left(r, X_r^{t,x}\right) \cdot J_{t,r}(x) \right] dW_r^k \ ,$$

which is virtually the same equation as (3.3.1) *only that Fréchet derivatives of the vector fields have replaced the usual derivative. Here* $J_{r,t}$ *can be understood as the sensitivity of* X_t *to a variation of the point* X_r. *It is also well-known that in the Markovian framework the equality*

$$J_{t,T}(X_r) \times V\left(r, X_r\right) = \mathcal{D}_t\left(X_T\right)$$

holds.

3.3. **Analysis on** $[T_h, T]$**.** Classically, the Lie bracket in the Hörmander's condition appears through the evolution of $J_{t,s}^{-1}$ together with the vector fields $V_k(t, X)$. As such it will be crucial to understand the evolution of $J_{t,s}^{-1}$. However, in our non-Markovian framework the matrix-valued process $J_{t,s}$ might fail to be invertible at all times.

However thanks to the delay structure, a perturbation of X at time $t \in [T_h, T]$ will affect X_T through only $\partial_0 V_k(s, X)$. This is seen in the simplification of Eq. 3.3.1 on the interval $[T_h, T]$. We treat it in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.5. *J satisfies the following SDE, for $T_h \le t \le s \le T$*

$$J_{t,s} = \mathrm{id} + \sum_{k=0}^{m} \int_t^s \partial_0 \widetilde{V}_k(r, X) \cdot J_{t,r} dW_r^k \ , \tag{3.5.1}$$

where we take the convention that $J_{t,r} = 0$ of $r < t$. Moreover, $\{J_{t,r}\}_{T_h \le t \le r \le T}$ exists for all time and satisfies the following moment bounds:

$$\forall p \ge 1,\ \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{T_h \le t \le r \le T} \|J_{t,r}\|^p \right) < \infty$$

We also give the following proposition allowing us to differentiate $J_{t,T}$ in t.

Proposition 3.6. *For all $T_h < s < t < T$ we have the following relation,*

$$J_{t,T} - J_{s,T} = -\sum_{k=0}^{m} \int_s^t J_{r,T} \cdot \partial_0 V_k(r, X) d\mathcal{W}_r^{k,0} \tag{3.6.1}$$

where the integral is understood as a rough integral with respect to $\mathcal{W}$.

Proof. By direct computation we see that the SDE (3.5.1) can be written on $T_h \le s \le t \le T$ RDE as:

$$J_{s,t} = \mathrm{id} + \int_s^t \sum_{k=0}^{m} \partial_0 V_k(r, X) \cdot J_{s,r} d\mathcal{W}_t^{k,0} \ ,$$

and because we are dealing with a linear RDE, $(J_{s,T}; T_h \le s \le T)$ remains invertible and we have the splitting:

$$J_{s,T} = J_{T_h,T} J_{T_h,s}^{-1} \ . \tag{3.6.2}$$

Applying the chain rule for $dJ^{-1} = -J^{-1} dJ J^{-1}$, we have:

$$J_{t,T} - J_{s,T} = J_{T_h,T} J_{T_h,t}^{-1} - J_{T_h,T} J_{T_h,s}^{-1}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= - J_{T_h,T} \int_s^t J_{T_h,r}^{-1} \cdot \left[\sum_{k=0}^m \partial_0 V_k(r, X) \cdot J_{T_h,r}^{-1} \right] \cdot J_{T_h,r}^{-1} d\mathcal{W}_r^{k,0} \\
&= - J_{T_h,T} \sum_{k=0}^m \int_s^t J_{T_h,r}^{-1} \cdot \partial_0 V_k(r, X) d\mathcal{W}_r^{k,0} \\
&= - \sum_{k=0}^m \int_s^t J_{r,T} \cdot \partial_0 V_k(r, X) d\mathcal{W}_r^{k,0} \ .
\end{aligned}
$$

□

Remark 3.7. *The splitting property (3.6.2) is one of the main limitations of this paper. This property gives the invertibility of $\{J_{s,T}\}_{s\in[T_h,T]}$ and its regularity in s. This property does not hold for $s \leq T_h$ since there would be an extra noise coming from the delays. Additionally, when V_k is a general path-dependent functional there is no obvious way to obtain the invertibility of $J_{s,T}$ and its regularity in s.*

4. Malliavin's argument: smoothing by Gaussian noise

The gist of Malliavin's argument is that the random variable X_T is a complicated function of the Brownian motion W. Provided that such a map is smooth enough, and because Gaussian noise is smooth, one expects X_T to have a smooth density. The quantity that encodes this dependence is the Malliavin matrix $\mathcal{M}_{0,T} \in M_d(\mathbb{R})$ which is defined as:

$$
\mathcal{M}_{0,T} := \int_0^T \mathcal{D}_s X_T \left(\mathcal{D}_s X_T\right)^* ds = \left\{ \int_0^T \sum_{k=1}^m \mathcal{D}_s^k \left(X_T\right)^i \mathcal{D}_s^k \left(X_T\right)^j ds \right\}_{i,j} . \tag{4.0.1}
$$

It is morally a Gram matrix or a covariance matrix of the sensitivities of X_T to the Brownian motion W. The norm of its inverse will control the smoothness of the map $W \mapsto X_T$. Let $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $|\eta|_{\mathbb{R}^d} = 1$. Thanks to Proposition 3.3 we have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\langle \eta, \mathcal{M}_{0,T}\eta \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} &= \int_0^T \langle \eta, \mathcal{D}_s X_T \left(\mathcal{D}_s X_T\right)^* \eta \rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d} ds \\
&\geq \int_{T_h}^T \left| V(s, X)^* J_{s,T}^* \eta \right|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 ds \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{T_h}^T \left| \eta^* J_{s,T} V_j(s, X) \right|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 ds \ .
\end{aligned}
$$

Remark 4.1. *In the Markovian case, it is very convenient to introduce the reduced Malliavin matrix $\mathcal{C}_{0,T}$ such that $\mathcal{M}_{0,T} = J_{0,T}\mathcal{C}_{0,T}J_{0,T}^*$. In that case, tangent processes have the multiplicative property*

$$
J_{s,T} = J_{0,T} J_{0,s}^{-1} \ ,
$$

and one obtains:

$$
\mathcal{C}_{0,T} := \int_0^T J_{0,s}^{-1} V\left(s, X\right) \left(V\left(s, X\right)\right)^* \left(J_{0,s}^{-1}\right)^* ds \ , \tag{4.1.1}
$$

which is an adapted process. This classical trick allows to use Itô calculus to study the matrix $\mathcal{C}_{0,T}$ and relate its evolution to iterated Lie brackets, thus to the Hörmander's condition. See the general guidelines of Theorem 4.5 in [Hai11].

However, in our setting, such an approach is not possible because the infinitesimal flow property (Eq. (3.3.1)) takes a more complicated form. It is a priori not obvious to find a reduced Malliavin matrix which is the integral of an adapted process. This is the reason why, we perform an analysis only on the segment $[T_h, T]$.

4.1. **The evolution of Z_F and its derivatives.** In this subsection, we fix a functional of time and $\left(X_t, X_{t-h_1}, \dots, X_{t-h_{N-1}}\right)$ denoted by $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^N \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and compute the expansion as a rough integral of $\{\eta^* J_{t,T} F(t, X)\}_{t\in[T_h,T]}$ on the path $\mathcal{W}$. For notational simplicity we define

$$Z_F(t) := \eta^* J_{t,T} F(t, X) \ .$$

The underlying assumption is that F is smooth and all of its derivatives at any order are bounded.

Recall that the rough path $\left(\mathcal{W}(\overline{h}), \mathbb{W}(\overline{h})\right)$ is the lift of W taken with the family of double delays $\overline{h}$ and defined at subsection 2.2. We also mentioned at Remark 2.7 that the functionals V_k have discontinuities at time h_i. In order to avoid problems due to this lack regularity and to be able to use the Norris' lemma we define

$$T_{\overline{h}} := \sup\{\overline{h} \cap [0, T)\} \vee T_h \in (0, T).$$

Note that on the interval the analysis above concerning the Malliavin derivative holds. We also have the following lemma where all the integrands are free of discontinuities on $[T_{\overline{h}}, T]$.

Lemma 4.2. *For all $T_{\overline{h}} < s \le t < T$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} Z_F(t) - Z_F(s) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left[\int_s^t Z_{[F,V_k]}(r) d\mathcal{W}_r^{k,0} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_s^t Z_{\partial_i F(\cdot,X)\cdot V_k(\cdot - h_i, X)}(r) d\mathcal{W}_r^{k,i} \right] \\ + \int_s^t Z_{\{\partial_t F(\cdot,X) + [F,V_0] + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \partial_i F(\cdot,X)\cdot V_0(\cdot - h_i, X)\}}(r) dr \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.1}$$

where all the integrands are controlled by $\mathcal{W}(\overline{h})$ and the integrals are rough integrals of $\mathcal{W}(\overline{h})$. Additionally,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|Z_F\|^p_{\alpha,[T_{\overline{h}},T]} \right] < \infty, \ \textit{for all } p \ge 2, \tag{4.2.2}$$

and the remainder R_F defined by

$$R_F(s,t) := Z_F(t) - Z_F(s) - \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left[Z_{[F,V_k]}(s) \mathcal{W}_{s,t}^{k,0} + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} Z_{\partial_i F(\cdot,X)\cdot V_k(\cdot - h_i, X)}(s) \mathcal{W}_{s,t}^{k,i} \right] \ ,$$

for $T_{\overline{h}} < s \le t \le T$ and $s \notin \overline{h}$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|R_F\|^p_{2\alpha,[T_{\overline{h}},T]} \right] < \infty, \ \textit{for all } p \ge 2.$$

Proof. Apply the Leibniz rule on the product $Z_F(s) = \eta J_{s,T} F(s)$, and then use the rough integral expansions for F (Proposition 2.9) and $J_{\cdot,T}$ (Proposition 3.6). □

Note that we can apply Lemma 2.6 for the rough path $\mathcal{W}(\overline{h})$ and obtain that this path is θ-Holder rough. We can apply the Norris' Lemma in [HP13, Theorem 3.1] in the following form.

Lemma 4.3 (Norris lemma)**.** *There exist constants $p, r > 0$ such that for all $(A, A') \in \mathcal{D}^{2\alpha}_{\mathcal{W}(\overline{h})}([0, T], V)$ and B α-Hölder continuous, the path defined for $t, s \in [T_{\overline{h}}, T]$ by*

$$Z(t) - Z(s) = \int_s^t B_r dr + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \int_s^t A_r^{k,i} d\mathcal{W}_r^{k,i} \tag{4.3.1}$$

satisfies

$$\|A\|_{\infty,[T_{\overline{h}},T]} + \|B\|_{\infty,[T_{\overline{h}},T]} \le C\mathcal{R}^p \|Z\|^r_{\infty,[T_{\overline{h}},T]}$$

where the constant C depends only on $T, \{h_i\}$ and m and

$$\mathcal{R} := 1 + L_\theta^{-1}(\mathcal{W}(\overline{h})) + \left|\left|\left|\mathcal{W}(\overline{h})\right|\right|\right|_\alpha + \|A, A'\|_{\mathcal{W}(\overline{h}),2\alpha} + \|B\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha,[T_{\overline{h}},T]}.$$

The choice of $T_{\overline{h}}$ is mainly motivated by the fact that $\|B\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha,I}$ might become infinite if the interval I contains an element of $\overline{h}$.

For notational simplicity we define the key quantity for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathcal{R}_n := 1 + L_\theta^{-1}(\mathcal{W}(\overline{h})) + \left|\left|\left|\mathcal{W}(\overline{h})\right|\right|\right|_\alpha + \sum_{F\in\bar{\mathcal{V}}_n}\left[\|Z_F\|_{\mathcal{C}^\alpha,[T_{\overline{h}},T]} + \|R_F\|_{2\alpha,[T_{\overline{h}},T]}\right] \tag{4.3.2}$$

which satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{R}_n^p] < \infty$ for all $p > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall the definition of j_0 in our Hörmander assumption 1.4. It is the rank such that $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_{j_0}$ has the uniform spanning condition.

Lemma 4.4. *Fix $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. There exist deterministic constants $p_0, q_0, C > 0$ depending on j_0, T and $\{h_i\}$, such that for all $F \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}_{j_0}$, we have*

$$|Z_F|_{\infty,[T_{\overline{h}},T]} \le C\mathcal{R}_{j_0}^{p_0}\langle\eta, \mathcal{M}_{0,T}\eta\rangle^{q_0}. \tag{4.4.1}$$

Proof. We reason by induction over the index j_0.

For initial step $j_0 = 0$, we start by the fact that there exists a constant $C_{h,T}$ such that for all $j = 1 \dots m$

$$\|Z_{V_j}\|_{\infty,[T_{\overline{h}},T]} \le C_{h,T}\langle\eta, \mathcal{M}_{0,T}\eta\rangle^{\frac{\alpha}{2\alpha+1}}\|Z_{V_j}\|^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+1}}_{\alpha,[T_{\overline{h}},T]}. \tag{4.4.2}$$

To prove that fact, simply repeat the interpolation inequality argument as in the proof of Lemma 5 in [HP13] on $[T_{\overline{h}}, T]$ and obtain that

$$\sup_{s\in[T_{\overline{h}},T]}\left|Z_{V_j}(s)\right| \le C_{h,T}\|Z_{V_j}\|^{\frac{2\alpha}{2\alpha+1}}_{L^2([T_{\overline{h}},T])}\|Z_{V_j}\|^{\frac{1}{2\alpha+1}}_{\alpha,[T_{\overline{h}},T]}$$

We finish the proof of Eq. (4.4.2) with the obvious inequalities

$$\|Z_{V_j}\|^2_{L^2([T_{\overline{h}},T])} \le \langle\eta, \mathcal{M}_{0,T}\eta\rangle.$$

Finally, Eq. (4.4.2) implies (4.4.1) because $\|Z_{V_j}\|_{\alpha,[T_{\overline{h}},T]}\| \le \mathcal{R}_0$.

Now for the induction step, we assume that the result holds true for j_0. Consider $F \in \overline{\mathcal{V}}_{j_0+1}$. Due to the definition of the brackets at (1.2.1), there exists $G \in \mathcal{V}_{j_0}$ such that G is a function of the form $G : \mathbb{R}^+ \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^N \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and Z_F is a Gubinelli derivative of Z_G or Z_F is the absolutely continuous part in the decomposition of Z_G. We apply the Norris Lemma 4.3 to Equation (4.2.1) for Z_G on $[T_{\overline{h}}, T]$ to have the existence of C_1, p_1 and q_1 such that

$$|Z_F|_{\infty,[T_{\overline{h}},T]} \le C_1\mathcal{R}_{j_0}^{p_1}\sup_{G\in\mathcal{V}_{j_0}}|Z_G|^{q_1}_{\infty,[T_{\overline{h}},T]}.$$

This implies by induction hypothesis that there are p_0 and q_0 such that

$$|Z_F|_{\infty,[T_{\overline{h}},T]} \le C_1\mathcal{R}_{j_0+1}^{p_0}\langle\eta, \mathcal{M}_{0,T}\eta\rangle^{q_0}.$$

The fact that this inequality is in particular true for $F \in \mathcal{V}_{j_0+1}$ is what we need to iterate. □

4.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.5.** We first prove the theorem under the assumptions (i) or (ii). It is classical that $\mathbb{E}\left[|\mathcal{M}_{0,T}^{-1}|^p\right] < \infty$ for all $p \ge 2$ is a sufficient condition for the existence of smooth densities for X_T(see for example [NP88, Theorem 2.1.4]). As shown in [Hai11, Lemma 4.7], this latter statement is itself implied by the existence for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$ of a constant C_p such that:

$$\sup_{|\eta|=1}\mathbb{P}\left(\langle\eta, \mathcal{M}_{0,T}\eta\rangle \le \varepsilon\right) \le C_p\varepsilon^p \tag{4.4.3}$$

We now use the inequality (4.4.1) at time T and obtain

$$\inf_{|\eta|=1}\inf_{\mathbf{x}\in\Omega}\sup_{F\in\overline{\mathcal{V}}_{j_0}}|\eta^* F(T,\mathbf{x})|\leq C\mathcal{R}_{j_0}^{p_0}\langle\eta,\mathcal{M}_{0,T}\eta\rangle^{r_0}.$$

Due to the Hörmander condition in assumption 1.4 the left hand side is a positive deterministic constant that we denote $\delta>0$. We obtain

$$\langle\eta,\mathcal{M}_{0,T}\eta\rangle\geq\frac{\delta^{1/r_0}}{(C\mathcal{R}_{j_0}^{p_0})^{1/r_0}}.$$

Using the integrability of $\mathcal{R}_{j_0}$ we easily obtain (4.4.3).

Remark 4.5 (Special case of bounded diffusion)**.** *Note that the classical Hörmander theorem requires a pointwise spanning condition. This is due to the fact that in the Markovian case the derivative of the flow $J_{t,T}$ is invertible for all $t\in[0,T]$ and the spanning condition is only required at the initial point of the diffusion. We do not have any hope of obtaining this invertibility. Thus we are only able to reason at time T and check a spanning condition at the random variable (T,X_T) via our uniform condition 1.4. Note that if we know a priori that the diffusion is bounded we can still have a more pointwise statement of the Hörmander condition. In order to state this result we give a weaker version of Assumption 1.4.*

We now prove the theorem under assumption (iii). Denote C the constant bounding X_t. j_0 is finite and the functions $F\in\overline{\mathcal{V}}_{j_0}$ are continuous on a finite dimensional space. Thus there exists η^* with $|\eta^*|=1$ and $\mathbf{x}^*\in\mathcal{C}^\alpha$ with such that

$$\inf_{|\eta|=1}\inf_{\substack{\mathbf{x}\in\Omega\\|\mathbf{x}|_\infty\leq C}}\sup_{F\in\overline{\mathcal{V}}_{j_0}}|\eta F(T,\mathbf{x})|=\sup_{F\in\overline{\mathcal{V}}_{j_0}}|\eta^* F(T,\mathbf{x}^*)|$$

We now use the Hormander condition 1.4.1 at the point $\mathbf{x}^*$ to obtain that the existence of $F^*\in\overline{\mathcal{V}}_{j_0}$ such that $|\eta^* F^*(T,\mathbf{x}^*)|=\delta>0$. Similarly to the beginning of this section we obtain that

$$\langle\eta,\mathcal{M}_{0,T}\eta\rangle\geq\frac{\delta^{1/r_0}}{(C\mathcal{R}_{j_0}^{p_0})^{1/r_0}}.$$

and finish the proof.

5. Examples

5.1. **Uniformly elliptic diffusions.** At this subsection we assume that there exists $\varepsilon>0$ such that for the order of symmetric matrices we have

$$VV^*\geq\varepsilon id.$$

Note that under this assumption the uniform spanning condition holds for $j_0=0$ and we obtain the smoothness of X_T. However this results is not new. Indeed in [KS84] and also in [BCC16], it is shown in a general path-dependent framework that this condition implies the smoothness of X_T.

5.2. **Langevin Equation with Delay.** Consider the diffusion in $\mathbb{R}^2$

$$\begin{aligned}dp_t&=V_0(p_t,q_t)dt+V_1(p_t,q_t,p_{t-h},q_{t-h})\circ dW_t\\dq_t&=p_t dt\ .\end{aligned}$$

with V_1 uniformly elliptic. By checking the spanning condition, one realizes that $(\mathcal{V}_j;j\geq0)$ is stationary from the index $j=0$ and for all $j\geq0$:

$$\mathcal{V}_0=\left\{\begin{pmatrix}V_1\\0\end{pmatrix}\right\}=\mathcal{V}_j\ .$$

We compute $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_0$

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} V_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} V_0 \\ p_s \end{pmatrix}\right] + \partial_1 \begin{pmatrix} V_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} V_0(p_{s-h}, q_{s-h}) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} * \\ -V_1 \end{pmatrix} .$$

Hence the uniform spanning condition is satistied. Notice that the semi-brackets play absolutely no role in this case, only the standard case is extended "as is".

5.3. **Noise flowing from the past and semi-brackets.** We now consider the following diffusion

$$\begin{pmatrix} p_t \\ q_t \\ r_t \end{pmatrix} = \int_0^t \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -r_{s-h} \end{pmatrix} dW_s^1 + \int_0^t \begin{pmatrix} -p_{s-h} \\ q_{s-h} \\ \sqrt{1+r_{s-h}^2} \end{pmatrix} dW_s^2 .$$

Again, we check the spanning condition. We have:

$$\mathcal{V}_0 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -r_{s-h} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -p_{s-h} \\ q_{s-h} \\ \sqrt{1+r_{s-h}^2} \end{pmatrix} \right\} = \mathcal{V}_j .$$

We compute the semi-brackets $\partial_1 V_2(t) V_1(t-h)$, $\partial_1 V_1(t) V_2(t-h)$ hence finding a subset of $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_0$. We have:

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -r_{s-h} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \\ -\frac{r_{s-h} r_{s-2h}}{\sqrt{1+r_{s-h}^2}} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ -\sqrt{1+r_{s-2h}^2} \end{pmatrix} \right\} \subset \overline{\mathcal{V}}_0 .$$

Again, the uniform spanning condition is satisfied and X_s has smooth densities for $s > h$. As the previous computation shows, semi-brackets are crucial in this case.

References

[BCC16] Vlad Bally, Lucia Caramellino, and Rama Cont. Pathwise calculus for non-anticipative functionals. In *Stochastic Integration by Parts and Functional Itô Calculus*, pages 125–152. Springer, 2016.

[Bel04] Denis R. Bell. Stochastic differential equations and hypoelliptic operators. In *Real and stochastic analysis*, Trends Math., pages 9–42. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2004.

[BM91] Denis R. Bell and Salah Eldin A. Mohammed. The Malliavin calculus and stochastic delay equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 99(1):75–99, 1991.

[BM95] Denis R. Bell and Salah-Eldin A. Mohammed. Smooth densities for degenerate stochastic delay equations with hereditary drift. *Ann. Probab.*, 23(4):1875–1894, 1995.

[CF10] Thomas Cass and Peter Friz. Densities for rough differential equations under Hörmander's condition. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 171(3):2115–2141, 2010.

[CHLT15] Thomas Cass, Martin Hairer, Christian Litterer, and Samy Tindel. Smoothness of the density for solutions to Gaussian rough differential equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 43(1):188–239, 2015.

[FH14] Peter K. Friz and Martin Hairer. *A course on rough paths*. Universitext. Springer, Cham, 2014. With an introduction to regularity structures.

[Hai11] Martin Hairer. On Malliavin's proof of Hörmander's theorem. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 135(6-7):650–666, 2011.

[Hör67] Lars Hörmander. Hypoelliptic second order differential equations. *Acta Mathematica*, 119(1):147–171, 1967.

[HP13] Martin Hairer and Natesh S. Pillai. Regularity of laws and ergodicity of hypoelliptic SDEs driven by rough paths. *Ann. Probab.*, 41(4):2544–2598, 2013.

[Hsu02] Elton P. Hsu. *Stochastic analysis on manifolds*, volume 38 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.

[KS84] Shigeo Kusuoka and Daniel Stroock. Applications of the malliavin calculus, part i. *North-Holland Mathematical Library*, 32:271–306, 1984.

[Kun84] H. Kunita. Stochastic differential equations and stochastic flows of diffeomorphisms. In *École d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour, XII—1982*, volume 1097 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 143–303. Springer, Berlin, 1984.

[Kun97] Hiroshi Kunita. *Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations*, volume 24. Cambridge university press, 1997.

[Lej12] Antoine Lejay. Global solutions to rough differential equations with unbounded vector fields. In *Séminaire de probabilités XLIV*, pages 215–246. Springer, 2012.

[LS01] Robert S. Liptser and Albert N. Shiryaev. *Statistics of random processes. I*, volume 5 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, expanded edition, 2001. General theory, Translated from the 1974 Russian original by A. B. Aries, Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability.

[NNT+08] Andreas Neuenkirch, Ivan Nourdin, Samy Tindel. Delay equations driven by rough paths. *Electron. J. Probab*, 13(67):2031–2068, 2008.

[NP88] David Nualart and Étienne Pardoux. Stochastic calculus with anticipating integrands. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 78(4):535–581, 1988.

[Nua06] David Nualart. *The Malliavin calculus and related topics*, volume 1995. Springer, 2006.

[OP89] Daniel Ocone and Étienne Pardoux. A generalized itô-ventzell formula. application to a class of anticipating stochastic differential equations. In *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, volume 25, pages 39–71, 1989.

[Str83] Daniel W Stroock. Some applications of stochastic calculus to partial differential equations. In *Ecole d'Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XI—1981*, pages 267–382. Springer, 1983.

Université Paul Sabatier, Toulouse 3 – Institut de mathématiques de Toulouse (IMT) – 118, route de Narbonne, 31400, Toulouse, France

E-mail address: reda.chhaibi@math.univ-toulouse.fr

Department of Mathematics – ETH Zürich – ETH-Zentrum, CH-8092 Zürich, Switzerland

E-mail address: ibrahim.ekren@math.ethz.edu